

1
2
3
4
5 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
6 **FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS**

7 **ALBERTO D. ESPAYOS,**) **Case No: 1:12-CV-00017**
8)
9 **Plaintiff,**)
10 **v.**)
11 **PAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a**)
12 **Delaware corporation, and ROME**)
13 **RESEARCH CORPORATION, a New**)
14 **York corporation,**)
15 **Defendants.**)

16 **LEONORA C. ANGELLO, JESSE MUNA**) **Case No. 1:12-CV-00019**
17 **VILLAR, ALEXANDER U. IGISAIAR,**)
18 **and MICHAEL H. NAPUTI,**)
19 **Plaintiffs,**)
20 **v.**)
21 **PAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a**)
22 **Delaware corporation, and ROME**)
23 **RESEARCH CORPORATION, a New**)
24 **York corporation,**)
25 **Defendants.**)

26 **ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION**

27 This matter is before the Court on the parties' oral motion to consolidate the two above-
28 captioned cases.

1 When actions “involve a common question of law or fact,” the district court may join
2 them for hearing or trial, consolidate them, or issue other orders to avoid unnecessary cost or
3 delay. Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). A district court has broad discretion to consolidate actions. *Investors*
4 *Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). The
5 court balances “the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any
6 inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause.” *Huene v. U.S.*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir.
7 1984).

9 In both law and fact, the two actions are inextricably intertwined. All the Plaintiffs
10 worked for Defendants. Plaintiff Angello alleges that she was subjected to sexual harassment at
11 the workplace and a hostile work environment. The remaining Plaintiffs allege that Defendants
12 retaliated against them by taking adverse employment actions after Plaintiffs assisted the Equal
13 Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) in its investigation of Plaintiff Angello’s
14 claims.
15


16 At a case management conference on February 20, 2013, the Court suggested
17 consolidating the two cases. Both parties agreed that consolidation was appropriate, and they
18 jointly moved to consolidate.

19 For these reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 20
21 1. The Clerk shall consolidate these actions such that the earlier filed action, 1-12-CV-
22 00017, is the lead case. Case Number 1-12-CV-00019 shall be administratively
23 closed.
- 24 2. All future pleading, motions, and other papers shall be filed in 1-12-CV-00019, and
25 shall be captioned “ALBERTO D. ESPAYOS, LEONORA C. ANGELLO, JESSE
26 MUNA VILLAR, ALEXANDER U. IGISAIAR, and MICHAEL H. NAPUTI,
27
28

1 Plaintiffs, v. PAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, and
2 ROME RESEARCH CORPORATION, a New York corporation, Defendants.”

3 ~~25th~~
4 SO ORDERED this ~~22nd~~ day of February, 2013.

5 
6 _____
7 RAMONA V. MANGLONA
8 Chief Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28